



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,539	10/09/2001	Shiro Fujieda	OMRNP008	9058
22434 75	590 11/03/2004		EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			LE, BRIAN Q	
P.O. BOX 778			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778				FAFER NUMBER
			2623	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. Applicant	t(s)				
	FUJIEDA, SHIRO				
Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit					
Brian Q Le 2623					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponde Period for Reply	ence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be consided. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce a earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	e of this communication. (133).				
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 21	3.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 October 2001</u> is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. Set 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form. 	85(a). ee 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) □ All b) □ Some * c) ⊠ None of: 1. ☑ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
1ttachment(c)					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	tion (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2623

Drawings

1. The drawing is of insufficient quality for publication (Note handwritten portions).

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-2, and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cohen U.S. Patent No. 6,337,925.

Regarding claim 1, Cohen teaches a method of inspecting a contour of a target object (abstract), said method comprising the steps of:

preparing a variable-density image of said contour (gradient calculation of pixels of image)

(column 5, lines 19-33);

extracting edge pixels along and from said contour on said image (masked and extracted traced object) (column 7, lines 3-25 and column 8, lines 50-62);

measuring directions of said edge pixels (column 4, 65-67 and column 5, lines 35-38); selecting said edge pixels sequentially one edge pixel at a time (column 10, lines 60-67) and comparing the direction of said one edge pixel with the direction of another of said edge pixels

Application/Control Number: 09/974,539

Art Unit: 2623

(column 19, lines 29-67) at a specified distance (given/predetermined width) (column 13, lines 10-12) from said one edge pixel to obtain a comparison result; and determining presence or absence of a defect in said contour from the comparison results obtained for said edge pixels (The process of determining the opacities and confidence of edges) (column 19, lines 7-25 and column 20, lines 35-60).

Regarding claim 2, Cohen teaches the method comprising the step of selecting said specified distance (predetermined edge zone width) (column 19, line 50).

For claim 4, please refer back to claim 1 for the teachings and explanations.

Referring to claim 5, Cohen discloses the apparatus wherein said measuring means measures an angle for each of said edge pixels, said angle indicating a perpendicular direction to the direction of density gradient at said each edge pixel (column 14, lines 31-47).

For claim 6, Cohen also discloses the apparatus wherein said comparing means include distance setting means for setting said specified distance (column 19, lines 30-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen U.S. Patent No. 6,337,925 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shiohara U.S. Patent No. 6,343,158.

Application/Control Number: 09/974,539

Art Unit: 2623

Regarding claim 3, Cohen discloses the usage of various extraction/masking techniques in the selection process (column 18, lines 41-51 and column 21, lines 57-65). However, Cohen does not explicitly discuss the selecting one from a plurality of edge-extraction filters each with a mask of a different size. Shiohara teaches an edge processing of images (abstract) utilizes the usage/selection of different filters (high and low frequency filters) with a mask of a different size (FIG. 14-FIG.15; column 2, lines 25-47; and column 6, lines 25-44). Modifying Cohen's method of processing edges of image according to Shiohara would able to allow the flexibility in using different filters with a mask of a different size to better isolate/extract/filter the selected edge of the image. This would improve processing and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Cohen according to Shiohara.

Regarding claim 7, please refer back to claim 3 for the teachings and explanations.

CONCLUSION

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to edge detection:

- U.S. Pat. No. 6,366,699 to Kuwano, teaches scheme for extractions and recognitions of telop characters from video data.
 - U.S. Pat. No. 6,415,053 to Norimatsu, teaches image processing method and apparatus.
- U.S. Pat. No. 5,930,391 to Kinjo, teaches method of extracting a region of a specific configuration and determining copy conditions.

Application/Control Number: 09/974,539

Art Unit: 2623

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Q Le whose telephone number is 703-305-5083. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 A.M - 5:30 P.M.

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au can be reached on 703-308-6604. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to TC Customer Service whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

BL October 23, 2004

SAMIR AHMED PRIMARY EXAMINER